Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Place of the Word-Accent in Hebrew

MAX L. MARGOLIS

DROPSIE COLLEGE

LANGUAGE is an historical product. As such it has its biography and chronology. Linguistic phenomena must therefore be studied genetically, that is to say, philologically. Empirical grammar is just as different from the philological kind as the homely interpretation of a literary document differs from skilled exegesis. The two methods may even yield contrary results. Thus, from the point of view of empiricism, the rule given in § 29 of the last[1] edition of Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* that in the accentuation of Hebrew words *milraʿ* predominates[2] is not quite correct even when the developed stage of the language is considered;[3] the reverse is certainly the truth when we ascend to the beginnings. To prove my point, the following observations may be in place.

The traditional system of Hebrew accentuation can be mastered in its entirety only at the end of the Grammar. This is perhaps the reason why in the text-book alluded to it is scantily summarized at the threshold[4] and then forgotten at the end. The metrical system is properly treated in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* at the end.[5] That is the place where future Hebrew grammarians will have to discourse on Hebrew metre conveniently preceded by an account of the received accentuation. For it is clear that a knowledge of syntax is requisite for an adequate comprehension of the

[1] The twenty-eighth, Leipzig, 1909.

[2] "Der Hauptton der Wörter ruht nach der masoretischen Akzentuation meist auf der letzten Silbe, seltener auf der vorletzten."

[3] See at the conclusion of this paper

[4] § 15.

[5] ii[3], 358–368.

system.[6] Yet a cursory orientation is imperative at the very beginning. "The sentence antedates the word; the sentence-accent is therefore necessarily more original than the word-accent."[7] Without some sort of a knowledge of the Hebrew system of accentuation, an understanding of Hebrew phonology and morphology becomes nugatory. Now, the written text (*ketib*) of Scripture, on the surface at least, recognizes but two units; a maximal which is the section (פרשה) and a minimal which is the word (תבה). Between the two limits it would seem to discountenance all pauses. It knows of no verse-division.[8] It will not commit itself to one interpretation: the Torah has "forty-nine faces."[9] At a previous stage, when words were permitted to run together, the latitude of exegesis was still a wider one.[10] The heavenly Torah, according to Nahmani,[11] was written in *scriptio continua* (כתיבה רצופה). Thus, the first words of Scripture might be read: *In initio creabatur Deus.*[12] The word-division is therefore something traditional; it ministers to sense, the simple sense. Now, the word itself is a composite (witness *bə-ṣalmẹ̈-nū*, "in our image"), just as a number of words might conceivably be combined into a sense-unit. The Samaritans write הרגריזים, "Mount Gerizim," as one word.[13] The Jews write ביתאל, "Bethel," as one word,[14] but בית לחם, "Bethlehem," as two words.[15] Accordingly, the one is an

[6] See Wickes, *Poetical Accents*, ch. iv; *Prose Accents*, ch. iv.

[7] Wundt, *Die Sprache* (= *Völkerpsychologie*, i), ii, 393.

[8] Sofrim 3, 7; see art. "Verse-Division" in *JE.*

[9] p. Sanh. 22 *a*; see Bacher, *Exeget. Terminologie*, ii, 157 f. Comp. also b. Sanh. 34 *a* (Bacher, *ibid.*, 72).

[10] As may be exemplified by any line in the Eshmunazar inscription.

[11] Introd. to his commentary on the Pentateuch.

[12] בראש יתברא אלהים.

[13] See Cowley, *Samaritan Liturgy*, ii. p. liv (*s.v.*).

[14] See Baer on Gen. 12 8.

[15] On the subject of word-division in the biblical text comp. Sofrim 5, 10, 11 (and Müller's notes); p. Megillah 72 *a*; b. Pesaḥim 117 *a*; Norzi on Gen. 12 8, Ex. 17 16. The list No. 99 in 'Okla we-'Okla (see the references to the Masora, Norzi, and Heidenheim Frensdorff, *Massoret. Wbch.*, 369 *a*) enumerates fifteen words written as one word and read as two; three examples (מזה, מלכם, מהם) contain מה, one (והנהו) הוא, and two (מנהסערה, מנסערה) מן as an element; in the remainder of the examples (with the

example of two words habitually run together, as the other is of two words habitually separated. The spelling בצלמנו as one word is equally habitual, traditional. It goes no further than the habitual severance in the case of בצלם אלהים, "in the image of God."

While the word, in its traditional limits, is the minimal conceptual unit, it has no standing in phonetics. At least in ordinary speech, pausation may and may not coincide with the word-end. The minimal phonetic unit is the stress-group ("Sprechtakt"); its measure is equivalent to the distance between two consecutive strong-stressed syllables. The length of a stress-group is relative to the whole of a connected utterance, and varies according to the distribution of forces which itself is conditioned by the tempo of the speaker or the nature of the literary piece as it is recited with more or less solemnity. What in a slow, even tempo appears as broken up into a number of groups becomes in a recitation which aims at sense rather than at clear enunciation a compact unit with graded stresses ("Taktgruppe"). Both the shorter and the longer groups are rhythmic figures; in both, the intervals with weaker stresses will be reduced to the shortest possible limit.[16] In the received system of Hebrew accentuation, there are shorter and longer groups properly graded with reference to one another and to the longest group of which they are component parts. Absolute pausation is reached only at the end of a connected period which may cover more than the measure of a single verse. Within the period as a unit, relative pauses are freely distributed. Relative subordination of stresses is the supreme

exception of לבנימיני) the *ḳere* is based on an exegetical conception not presupposed by the *ketib*. Interesting are also the lists Nos. 100–102; the examples are again of unequal merit. The versions, notably the Septuagint, show differences in the word-division; Jer. 23 33 is the best-known example; see Driver, *Notes on Samuel*, p. xxx ff. In Arabic and Syriac (but particularly in Mandaic; see Nöldeke, § 14) certain words (forms) are habitually joined together; at the same time the converse process is equally observable, comp. Mandaic-Talmudic כד, Mishnic של in the editions, Biblical בשל.

[16] On the subject of stress-groups and their gradation comp. Sievers, *Phonetik*[5], §§ 620–653; Jespersen, *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, § 210; Sweet, *Primer of Phonetics*, §§ 91–113.

principle of the Hebrew system of accentuation. When the smallest measure is reached and it covers more than one word, the hyphen steps in as a mark of stress-union; in the relatively higher group, a "conjunctive accent" serves the same purpose; in the still higher group, a "disjunctive" of minor grade; and so on. Hyphenation goes naturally with a quickened tempo.[17]

It is well known that the retarded tempo was favored by Ben-Naphtali and the quicker by Ben-Asher. Where the latter is content with a hyphen, the former introduces an "accent."[18] The difference between the two cannot have been appreciably great.[19] In proof of this proposition may be mentioned in the first place the fact that frequently a "conjunctive accent" appears in one and the same word in front of a "disjunctive."[20] Then, the spirantization of the בגדכפת is effected by an immediately preceding vowel whether in the same word or in two separate words, and it is immaterial in the latter instance whether the phonetic union is indicated by the hyphen or by a "conjunctive."[21] In either case, we are dealing with a stress-group, shorter or longer, spoken without a pause implying a fresh impulse of force. A further proof is afforded by the rules which the

[17] A glance at (or preferably a reading aloud of) the first three verses of Scripture will substantiate the remarks in the text. I have in mind the interpretation of the unsophisticated Rashi. Had the accentuators chosen to make of the three one verse (comp. Ḳiddushin 30 *a*, with reference to Ex. 19 9; note in particular the decalogue according to the טעם העליון), there would have resulted visually a series of long groups held together by hyphens or by a multiplication of *servi*, whereas in the present less unwieldy division they are broken up into smaller groups coinciding for the most part, yet not altogether, with the word-division of the *ketib*. Once we adopt a less retarded mode of reading, the groups will lengthen, the words come closer together, and the hyphens multiply.

[18] So *e.g.* Gen. 1 4, יְהִי־אוֹר, Ben-Asher; יְהִי אוֹר, Ben-Naphtali. See Baer, *Genesis*, 81, n. 3.

[19] Grimme, *Hebr. Akzent-u. Vokallehre*, 30; Praetorius, *Über d. rückweichenden Accent*, 7. Grimme's view that the hyphen may be preceded by a strong stress is acceptable only if the relative gradation between it and the next following strong stress is had in mind.

[20] *E.g.* הִנָּנְךָ, Deut. 7 13.

[21] *E.g.* וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר, Gen. 1 5; וְהָיְתָה תֹהוּ, 1 2.

rabbis lay down for the distinct articulation of every speech-element in the *Shema'*.[22] The examples adduced cover indifferently words united by a hyphen and words joined together by means of a "conjunctive."[23] It follows that in ordinary reading which was less exact and therefore less retarded, not to mention ordinary speech, it was customary to utter all such word-groups with so complete a union of force that similar sounds were run together[24] and that even the syllabic division was obliterated to such an extent that laryngal sounds (the hamza, but also ע) were ignored.[25] But the strongest proof comes from the *ketib* itself. Whatever the cause of the peculiar orthography of the Ḳoran (on which subject there is a difference of opinion between Vollers[26] and Nöldeke[27]), so much is certain that the Hebrew *ketib* points to words spoken after the manner of the Arabic "pausals"[28] and to others uttered in close union with their syntactical dominants, *i.e.* as the weaker elements of stress-groups.

The most obvious instance of a stress-group in the *ketib* is afforded by the *'iḍāfeh* construction with a feminine noun ending in *-at* as the *muḍāf*. The retention of the closing consonant (*t*) is evidence of the close union of the component parts of the *'iḍāfeh*; contrast the disappearance of the same sound when the word is spoken pausally, "in the abso-

[22] p. Berakot 4 *d* (see Alfasi according to Tosafot Berak. 15 *b*, *s.v.* בין; Asheri, *ad locum*; Ṭūr, *'Oraḥ Ḥayyim*, § 61, with Karo's note); b. Berak. 15 *b*.

[23] *E.g.* עֲשֹׂב בְּשָׂדְךָ, בְּכָל־לְבַבְכֶם, Deut. 11 13. 15.

[24] The Arabic term is *'idġām*, the Hebrew הבלעה. See *Riḳma*, 141 f. (reputed opinion of Saadia concerning the pronunciation of בן נון with *'idġām* which is approved and carried further; the intervention of a "conjunctive" is pronounced no hindrance); *Miklol*, smaller Venice edition, 95 ff.

[25] Thus the fear was expressed that וְחָרָה אַף־, Deut. 11 17, might sound like וְחָרַף; נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה, v. 21, like נִשְׁבָּה יהוה (both examples show by the way that ַ and ָ were not qualitatively different). See also Sofrim 5, 10, where וחרה אף אפי is deleted by the Gaon of Wilna, and comp. Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, v–vii; Margolis, *ZAW*, xxvii (1907), 257.

[26] *Volkssprache u. Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, 158.

[27] *Beiträge z. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, 7; *Neue Beiträge*, 1 ff.

[28] Wright, ii[3], 368–373.

lute state." Thus, over against אדמה, Gen. 4 2, we have אדמת קדש, Ex. 3 5; the writing in two words, as was pointed out above, is just as habitual as is the union in one word in the case of אדמתכם, Gen. 47 23; it is simply a matter of orthography, but the morphological and phonetic configuration is identical in both cases. What is mutely hinted at by the *ketib*, is clearly brought out by the *ḳere*. The loss of the middle vowel (*a*) in אַדְמַת, whether in the combination אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ or in אַדְמַת מִצְרַיִם, Gen. 47 20, exactly as in אַדְמַתְכֶם, when compared with its retention in אֲדָמָה, shows that there is a difference in grade between the strong or pausal and the half-strong or non-pausal stress. It furthermore shows how immaterial it is whether the *muḏāf* is joined to its dominant by means of a hyphen or a "conjunctive." While the preference for the hyphen in אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ may be explained as due to a desire of avoiding a collision of the two stresses (the strong and the half-strong),[29] no such reason obtains in the case of אַדְמַת־עָפָר, Dan. 22 2. The hyphen is apparently the normal and the "conjunctive" a mere substitute; in a double *'iḏāfeh*, a "disjunctive" of minor grade may be resorted to, but the morphological configuration will not be altered, as in מִתְבוּאַת אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן, Josh. 5 12. The *ketib* is concerned solely with detached concepts; but the *ḳere* naturally joins together in utterance what is visually separate, and reduces phrases like אדמת־עפר, אדמת־קדש, אדמת מצרים to the level of אדמתכם. For practical purposes, the rule may be laid down that the distribution of the vowels in the "construct state" of any noun will be exactly the same as in the nominal element preceding a so-called "heavy" suffix.[30]

[29] Praetorius, *l.c.* 9 ff.

[30] Thus פְּרִי־אִישׁ, Prov. 12 14 ‖ פִּיכֶם(מִ), Num. 32 24; אֲבִי־עַד, Isa. 9 5 ‖ אֲבִיכֶם, Gen. 31 9; כְּמוֹ־אָבֶן, Ex. 15 5 ‖ כְּמוֹכֶם, Job 12 3, חָק־עוֹלָם, Ex. 30 21 ‖ חֻקְּכֶם, 5 14; יְדִי־חֶרֶב, Jer. 18 21 ‖ יֶדְיכֶם, Deut. 31 29, and so on. To מַכּוֹת as a construct state comp. מַכַּתְךָ, Deut. 28 59, which suggests מַכַּתְכֶם, just as במותי, Deut. 32 13, comports with בָּמֹתֵיכֶם, Lev. 26 30. אַרְצְכֶם, Lev. 19 9, would lead to אַרְצ, actually witnessed to by the Greek transliteration *αρς*; אַרְצְכֶם, on the other hand, points the way to a possible אַרְצֶכֶם, comp. וַעֲמָמֶךָ (inferred from וְעָמְךָ, Ps. 102 11) by the side of עַמְּךָ, Lam. 2 6. Comp. also שִׁבְיֵכֶם, Num. 31 19; פְּרִיהֶם, Am. 9 14, which recall שִׁבְיִ, פְּרִי. See *AJSL*, xii (1896), 219.

The weakened force with which the *muḍāf* is uttered results in stresslessness[31] when it consists of but one syllable,[32] while a form consisting of more than one syllable is subject to half-strong stressing.[33] In the case of the smallest measure of two syllables, the following rules seem to have governed the position of the stress:

(1) Of two unequal syllables, the longer was stressed.

(2) Where the duration was equal, the stress might conceivably rest on the one or the other. As a matter of fact, however, the only example in which both syllables maintained themselves in actual Hebrew is that of two long syllables, and then the stress rests on the second.

(3) (Open) syllables with long vowels or closed syllables with short vowels were regarded as longer than (open) syllables with short vowels. But even the latter kind of syllables might be differentiated according to the sonority of the vowel, the vowel *a* surpassing in this respect the others.[34]

In the form of a table, we obtain the following combinations:

cv̄:cv	*kā:la*	קָוֹל
cvcv̄:	*'abī:*, *ʾadaʾi:*, *binā:*	אֲבִי, יְדִי, בְּנוֹ
cv:cv	*ʾa:da*	יַד
cvcv:	*bina:*	Arab. *bna*
cv̄cv̄:	*ʿaʾinaʾi:*	עֵינַי

[31] Properly speaking, there is no such thing as stresslessness; it is simply a case of "weak" stressing.

[32] *E.g.* פֶּֽרְאִישׁ, Prov. 12 14. So soon, however, as the strong stress is deferred by the measure of a syllable, a half-strong stress is introduced, *e.g.* פֶּֽרְאֹשָׁו, Ex. 28 32. The ֽ (*meteg*) in itself is no sign of stress; it is really nothing more than a mark of caution for the purpose of preventing the slurring of a vowel when at a distance from the strong stress. See Baer, "Die Metheg-Setzung," in Merx's *Archiv*, i. 56 f. A closed syllable naturally protects its vowel; hence there is no call for the mark of caution; nevertheless, under the same conditions, a closed syllable is equally capable of being the bearer of a half-strong stress; pronounce accordingly חֻקֹּעֹלָם, Ex. 30 21, *ḥo:kˈʿola·m*.

[33] Provided, of course, the interval of a syllable separates it from the strong stress of the dominant.

[34] Jespersen, *l.c.* § 192, end. It is to be remembered, however, that it is difficult to say which of the case-vowels was the more currently used in primitive Hebrew. Thus, the actual Hebrew form in a given case may have resulted from one of the cases, and then been used indiscriminately for the others as well.

It is clear from the Hebrew equivalents that an unstressed short vowel was subject to reduction or total loss in the syllable preceding, and to total loss in the syllable following, the half-strong stress.

So soon as the *muḍāf* grew in length beyond the measure of two syllables, antepenultimate stressing was out of the question when one or the other of the two closing syllables was long. The position of the stress was then determined by the preceding table; hence *barū:ka*, *mamlakā:ta*, *barū-kaĭ:*, *dabaraĭ:*. On the other hand, when both the closing syllables were short, the stress might still be placed on the penultimate: *gabūra:ta*, *kabi:da*, *ṣadaḳa:ta*. But antepenultimate stressing was quite as possible: *iš:ata*, *ka:bida*, *aṭa:rata*. As for the part of the word preceding the (half-strong) stress, it is clear that it was spoken with so quick a tempo as to leave room at best for a second, quarter-strong, stress. The conditions are obvious. In the first place, the two stresses had to be separated by at least one syllable. Then, the syllable which became the bearer of the weaker stress might itself be short or long; when short, a further condition attached itself that the intervening syllable must likewise be short; when the latter was long, it entrained the immediately preceding short syllable and the two together became unstressed. Thus *mam::lakā:ta*, *da::baraĭ:*, but *gabūra:ta*. The effect of a stress, whether half or quarter strong, was to protect the vowel which bore it,[35] while unstressed vowels succumbed. Hence the examples selected in the foregoing assumed in Hebrew the forms בְּרוּכִי, בְּרוּךְ, מַמְלָכוֹת, עֲטֶרֶת, צִדְקַת, אֵשֶׁת, כֶּבֶד, כְּבַד, גְּבִירַת. It is evident that those with *milraʿ* accentuation were—*sit venia verbo*—*milʿel* in primitive Hebrew. It may further be observed

[35] Comp., however, Origen's transliteration λφνωθ for לִפְנוֹת, Ps. 46 6. The nearest approach to it in the Tiberian nikḵud is וּבְרִית, and the like (on וּמְצוּדֹתַי, see Kahle, *D. MT. des AT. nach d. babylon. Überlieferung*, 27; examples are available to me from a masoretic Genizah fragment which Dr. Schechter has been kind enough to turn over to me for publication, and from Origen). After all, the grammarian Hanau was not altogether wrong with his theory of the תנועה קלה (see his צהר התבה, ed. Grodno, 1805, 14, 18 ff.).

that, so soon as the strong stress of the dominant collides with the half strong of the *muḏāf*, the latter recedes by the measure of one (Hebrew) syllable, thus often coinciding with the place formerly occupied by the next weaker stress, visibly when the *muḏāf* has a "conjunctive," invisibly when the latter is replaced by a hyphen.[36]

When the syntactical dominant is a pronoun in the place of a noun, it and the nominal *muḏāf* are orthographically conjoined in one word. But that, as was pointed out above, is solely a matter of habit. Of greater importance is the circumstance that the strong stress falls on the nominal element, the pronoun becoming an enclitic. In the case of the so-called "light" suffixes, that is, of the pronominal element consisting of one syllable, the fact is obvious enough, recalling Greek analogies.[37] A phonetic result is the reduction[38] and even subsequent loss of closing long vowels, and the immediate loss of short vowels in the same position: hence *pī* (<*pī·-i̯a*), *pī·-ḵå* (<*pī·-ḵā*), *pī·-ḵ* (<*pī·-ḵī*), *pī·-hå* (<*pī·-hā*); but long *ū* remains: *pī·-nu*, *pī·-hu* (*pī·-u̯*). With the lengthening of the nominal form the stress due on the enclitic is thrown back on the closing vowel of the nominal element[39] which it thus safeguards; in the historical development of the language, this stress becomes the main (strong) stress of the combination; hence *dəḇarę·-nū* < *daba·ri:-nū*, etc. In the case of the so-called "heavy" suffixes, that is, the pronominal elements which originally consisted of two syllables (with a long vowel in the second) (*-kimā*, *-kinā*, *-himā*, *-hinā*), it is clear that the weight of the suffix might resist enclisis.[40] Either the stress indigenous to the pronominal element rested on the long ultima, then the stresslessness of the preceding syllable with the ensuing loss of its vowel (entraining in turn the disappearance of the

[36] See Praetorius' work cited above, and comp. above, n. 32.

[37] Comp. φῶς μου.

[38] *å* < *ā*. Kühner-Blass, *Griech. Gramm.*, i[3], § 89, n. 2: "Lange Silben der Encliticae werden in Beziehung auf die Betonung als kurze angesehen, weil die enklitischen Wörter rasch und ohne Nachdruck gesprochen werden."

[39] Comp. Greek σῶμά μου.

[40] Comp. Greek φῶς ὑμῶν.

next preceding laryngal) caused the stress of the enclitic to be thrown back on the stem-final of the noun which then became the main stress of the combination: *dəbårå·-mọ* (the next step was *dəbårå·-m*) < *daba·ra:-himmā*. Or the stress rested on the penultimate, causing reduction in the length of the concluding vowel, and on the other side stresslessness of the preceding stem-final of the noun; hence *dəbar-kẹ·må*, *dəbar-hẹ·må* (from which *dəbar-ke·m*, *dəbar-hẹ·m*). But the tendency of throwing back the stress of the enclitic on the stem-final of the noun might prevail; hence כֻּלְּהֶנָּה, כֻּלָּהֶם (=*kulla·-hm*). Thus, where in the combination of noun *plus* possessive pronoun we find in historical Hebrew *milraʿ* accentuation, as in פִּי, פִּיךָ, דְּבָרוֹ, דְּבָרָם, the forms upon which they are based, and which with the exception of the first still occur by the side of the others, are all *milʿel*.

As for the second part of the *ʾiḏāfeh*, when it consists of a noun in isolation (unencumbered by suffixes), it resembles to all intents and purposes the Arabic pausal.[41] It is clear that the Arabic forms themselves presuppose the absence of the *tanwīn*, and that the strong stress remained there where it was when the stem-finals were still sounded. Hence the *milraʿ* accentuation of the so-called "absolute state" is something comparatively recent. The permanence of the short vowel in the syllable preceding the strong stress, no matter what one may think of its quantity in Hebrew,[42] is apparently due to the retarded pronunciation characteristic of pausals; contrast the reduction of the same vowel when followed by the half-strong stress. It is well known that the vowels *i* and *u* more readily succumb even before pausals than the vowel *a*; another instance of the greater sonority of the latter.

Outside the *ʾiḏāfeh*, which is the most natural stress-group suggested by the *ketib*, other stress-groups are created by the *ḳere* wheresoever a syntactical union manifests itself, as for instance between nouns joined by means of "and" or be-

[41] Comp. יָד with *ʿiad*, מַלְכָּה with *malikah*, בָּנִים with *banīn*, בָּנוֹת with *banāt*, and so on. See the reference above, n. 28.

[42] See Grimme, *l.c.* 49 f.; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 101.

tween a noun and its attributive adjective. Thus we find עַם וָעָם, Esth. 1 22, compared with עַם מְרֻדֳּכָי, 3 6; בְּלֵב־טוֹב, Eccl. 9 7, compared with בְּלֵב־יָם, Ex. 15 8.[43] But here likewise the *ketib* led the way; comp. חכמת ודעת, Isa. 33 6. Note בֶּן־קָטָן, 2 Sam. 9 12;[44] hence בְּאָח־לִי, Ps. 35 14; and so דְּבָךְ קָטָן, 1 Sam. 22 15. There is a tendency therefore to keep the "absolute state" intact within the stress-group.

When we turn to the verb, the forms in combination with objective suffixes are developed accentually exactly as the corresponding forms of the noun when combined with possessive suffixes.[45] The forms with the endings ־וּן, ־ִין, = *-ūna*, *-īna*, are built, at least in "pause," exactly like the corresponding nominal forms ending in ־ִים, = *-īma*, quite correctly, for the "absolute state" of the noun represents a primitive pausal.[46] Just as the strong stress with which these forms were spoken is recognizable by the maintenance of the vowel (long or short) in the syllable near the stress, so conversely the reduction of a short vowel in the same position must needs indicate the half-strong stress which belongs to the form when joined to another word in one stress-group.[47] The same difference between pause and con-

[43] Comp. also לְדוֹר וָדוֹר, Isa. 34 17 over against מִדּוֹר לְדוֹר, 34 10. Comp. also חָק־עוֹלָם, Ps. 148 6 (object *plus* verb) by the side of חָק־נָתַן.

[44] Comp., however, שֵׁם־הָעִיר, Gen. 28 19 (Greek σεμ αειρ).

[45] Comp. נָתְנוֹ, Gen. 31 7, with דִּבְּרוֹ, Num. 30 3; גְּדָלָיו, Esth. 5 11, with מִכְפְּדֵי, Ps. 30 12, etc. Forms like אֶחְתֶּנְךָ, Jer. 22 24, and their like have their analogies in מִמֶּךָּ, Gen. 35 11. In בָּרְכְנוּכֶם, Ps. 118 26, the accent advances exactly as in בְּשַׂרְכֶם, Jdg. 8 7; hence we are at liberty to construct נָתְנֵכֶם, הֶרְגְנֵכֶם, etc.

[46] Comp. יְקוֹמוּן, Deut. 33 11, by the side of פְּרוּצִים, 1 Sam. 23 21, תְּשָׁקָבוּן, Isa. 50 11, תְּדַבָּקִין, Ruth 2 8, by the side of מְקֻדָּשִׁים, Ezek. 21 7.

[47] Hence אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁכְּבֶן אֶת־הַנָּשִׁים, 1 Sam. 2 22, contrasted with מֵרֵם יִשְׁכָּבוּ, Josh. 2 8. Comp., on the other hand, יָרֵם יִשְׁכָּבוּ, Gen. 19 4. Both forms reveal the *vis inertiae* of the stress which remains there where it stood in primitive Hebrew when endings consisting of two syllables were stressed while monosyllabic endings were unstressed. I am speaking of what was, or came to be, the strong stress. For when a form ending in a monosyllabic termination was joined in the context to the word next following in a stress-group, the half-strong stress might be allowed to rest on the monosyllabic ending; hence יִשְׁכְּבוּ שְׁנַיִם, Eccl. 4 11. In the context, therefore, both forms

text accentuation is found with the endings ־ָה = *-an*, and ־ָה = *-at*.[48] Both the "pausal" נִשְׁבָּרָה and the "absolute" נִשְׁבָּרָה (רוּחַ), Ps. 51 19, are primitive pausals; the difference in the position of the stress rests on the circumstance that whereas the verbal form ended primitively in *-at*, the nominal form ended in *-atu(n)*.[49] In the contextual forms the difference was naturally obliterated. But even there *mil'el* accentuation is retained when the penultimate syllable is a long one.[50]

The (subjective) pronominal suffixes which meet us in the forms of the first and second person of the "perfect" are seemingly on an equal footing with the objective pronominal suffixes joined to nominal or verbal forms, accentually speaking. That is to say, the suffixes of a pronominal character are originally enclitic. Where in the present state of the language the accent nevertheless rests on the suffix, as in the case of the "heavy" suffixes, the longer form of the suffix merely resisted the enclisis, with the result that in the combination what was originally the half-strong stress came to be the strong stress, and *vice versa*. עֲזַבְתָּם, Josh. 22 3, עֲזַבְתֶּם, Neh. 9 17, and עֲזַבְכֶם (inferred by analogy) show on the surface the same accentuation. Yet the following point of difference must not be overlooked. As is shown by the spirant in עֲזַבְכֶם over against the explosive in עֲזַבְתֶּם, the objective suffixes were joined to the form with its stem-final preserved, while the subjective suffixes were appended to the form after it had lost its stem-final. It follows from the nature of the formation of the "perfect" (which has its

ending in the longer termination and those with the shorter are indifferently *milra'*, while in pause only the former can be *milra'*, the latter being necessarily *mil'el*.

[48] Comp. וְאַבָּרֶה, Gen. 18 30; נִשְׁבָּרָה, Ps. 34 21; but וְאֹבְרָה אַף־הַפַּעַם, Gen. 18 32, נִשְׁבְּרָה מוֹאָב, Jer. 48 4.

[49] Hence also the dissonance between אַרְמָתוֹ, Deut. 32 43, and גְּמָלֶיהָ, Prov. 31 12. See on the latter form and its like, *AJSL*, xix (1902), 45 ff. In the forms with "heavy" suffixes, both sets of forms naturally coincide (see *ibid.* 168).

[50] Comp. קָמוּ בָנֶיהָ, Prov. 31 28; נָפְצוּ מֵעָלָיו, 2 Kings 25 5; הֵקַלּוּ הַמַּיִם, Gen. 8 8 (but רִבּוּ מְשׁוּבֹתֵינוּ, Jer. 14 7), etc.

analogies in late historical combinations of the participle with the pronoun in Aramaic[51]) that we are dealing in its case with a less archaic composition than in the instance of noun *plus* possessive suffix (and the verb *plus* objective suffix). It may be laid down as certain that the noun antecedes the verb, and that in the verb the imperfect is more ancient than the perfect. קָטַנְתָּ (comp. קָטֹנְתִּי, Gen. 32 11) is but an abbreviated קָטַן אַתָּה, 1 Sam. 15 17. While in historical Hebrew the distribution of stresses in a phrase like קָטַן אַתָּה proceeds in such a manner that the pronoun is the bearer of the strong stress, a different gradation is clearly presupposed in קָטַנְתָּ, where the strong stress rested on the nominal element of the combination (the predicate); hence the preservation of the vowel in the syllable preceding the strong stress, exactly as in the case of יָדַנוּ, etc. As for the form of the third person singular, the pausal form (*e.g.* זָכָר, Ps. 9 13) requires no further explanation; it is exactly analogous to the "absolute state" of the noun. But the contextual form (*e.g.* זָכַר יְהוָה, Jer. 44 21) has long been a puzzle;[52] for while it follows the analogy of the "construct state" of the noun with regard to the vowel of the ultima, thus indicating a corresponding half-strong stress, the retention of the vowel of the penultima is difficult. Yet it is no more difficult than the retention of the same vowel in the contextual forms of the pattern זָכְרָה, Lam. 1 7, יָכְלוּ, Gen. 37 4, and even יָדְעוֹן, Deut. 8 3 (comp. also אָזְלַת יָד, 32 36); the forms are clearly late when their vocalization is considered, the earlier forms for which, at least in the case of the feminine singular, Aramaic analogies exist,[53] having been supplanted. The truth is that in entering a combination with another word as a stress-group, the verbal form resisted complete subordination; and the reason is obviously this that a verbal form is a complete sentence in itself; hence its syntactical union with any word can be properly only of a sec-

[51] Syriac, Mandaic, Talmudic, Neo-Syriac.

[52] See Grimme, *l.c.* 49.

[53] Comp. סְלַקַת Dan. 7 20, וַאֲמַרַת 5 10.

ondary character. The same holds good of the forms of the imperfect without "afformatives"; the persistence of the long vowel, as for instance in the אָקוֹם forms, shows clearly that we are dealing with primitive pausals,[54] the strong stress effecting the retention of a short vowel in the syllable preceding it, which vowel remains in the developed language also in the context. Comp. also the treatment of the "absolute state" of the noun in similar conditions adverted to above.

An equally late procedure, dating from historical times, is the retention of an unstressed vowel which has become so in consequence of the shifting of the accent farther to the end of the word in the perfect with the so-called ו consecutive. Hence וְזָכַרְתָּ, Deut. 15 15, contrasted with וּזְכַרְתַּנִי, 1 Sam. 1 11, etc. In the case of a long vowel in the penultimate, the accentuation fluctuates between *milra'* and *mil'el*. The pausal accent equally acts as a check on the shifting of the accent.

On the other hand, the pausal accent effects *milra'* accentuation in the case of the imperfect *plus* the so-called ו consecutive in all forms not containing "afformatives." The pausal accent namely introduces normal accentuation of words spoken in isolation. In the context, on the other hand, the primitive mode of stress persisted. The common statement that the ו consecutive is prefixed to the jussive form of the imperfect is mechanical and misleading. It is true that a similar mode of stressing obtains in both.[55] But the reasons were absolutely different. The jussive and imperative were primitively spoken with the so-called "interjectional" accent. The imperfect following a ו consecutive, on the other hand, was originally a "conjunct" form with the stress resting on the relatively more important conjunction; in historical Hebrew, where the accent could not go farther than the penultimate, and certainly not to the conjunctional prefix, it was placed as near its original position as possible; hence *mil'el* accentuation.[56]

[54] Contrast אָקוֹם || Arab. *'aḳū·m-u*, with תָּקֻמְנָה || Arab. *taḳu·m-na*.

[55] Comp. especially the forms of לו״י roots.

[56] On the meaning of the terms "interjectional" and "conjunct," see the references in *AJSL*, xix (1902), 46, n. 4.

As with the ending הָ in the verb, so it fares with the old case-ending הָ = *-ā* (the primitive pausal for *-an*) in the noun; hence אַרְצָה, Gen. 24 52. It is to be observed that the nominal form is kept intact as far as possible; hence מִדְבָּרָה בֵּית אָוֶן, Josh. 18 12, הָאֹהֱלָה, Gen. 18 6, and the like; the stress falls in all cases upon the syllable which has it in the unencumbered form.

The preceding investigation has, I believe, shown conclusively that, genetically considered, *mil'el* accentuation predominates in Hebrew. In the primitive language, ultimate accentuation was possible only in connection with the half-strong stress resting on a long closing syllable. In all other forms, whether primitively pausal or non-pausal, the stress was found anywhere but on the ultima. Where we have in the present Hebrew ultimate accentuation, we are confronted by a loss of a syllable (through the disappearance of the stem-final, the reduction of dissyllabic suffixes to monosyllabic in consequence of the loss of the final vowel or contraction), or we are dealing with modern contextual forms. The rule currently given in our text-books about the predominance of *milra'* accentuation of Hebrew to which attention was drawn at the beginning of this paper disregards not only the genesis of forms, but abstracts likewise from the by-forms which are still preserved in historical Hebrew. Moreover, if *types* of forms are had in mind, the rule breaks down on the basis of pure statistics; one need only compare the forms of the perfect in pause,[57] and the result is obvious: the proportion of *mil'el* to *milra'* is 6:3.

[57] How late the non-pausal or contextual forms are, has been shown above. In the case of יָדָךְ (still worse is the case of כְּמֹךָ), the absence of a contextual פִּיךָ (in the place of פִּיךָ) shows the lateness of the form. The occasional forms like כָּלָךְ are developed correctly enough; comp. the feminine forms. In Origen's transliteration such forms predominate; perhaps through the influence of the Aramaic; comp. the parallel forms of the perfect like φαδιθ, etc. There is reason to believe that where the ה is absent in the *ketib*, a similar Aramaic pronunciation was intended. The *ḳere*, as elsewhere, reintroduced the more archaic forms; or rather, it levelled down forms minus ה to those with ה. The same was done by the *ḳere* in connection with את which was assimilated to אתה in all but three cases (Num. 11 15, Deut. 5 24, Ezek. 28 14). On יֹדֶךָ, see *AJSL*, xix (1903), 165.